



---

THE LIBRARY OF LIBANIUS

Author(s): A. F. Norman

Source: *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, Neue Folge, 107. Bd., 2. H. (1964), pp. 158-175

Published by: [J.D. Sauerländers Verlag](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41244219>

Accessed: 05/05/2013 23:37

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*J.D. Sauerländers Verlag* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Richtige sein, vgl. S. 167,14 καὶ δεδήλωκεν αὐτὴν δι' ἐλαχίστων Οὐαλεντίνος. — S. 167,8 ἀ δὲ P, nach Miller, Gö., We.: (τ)ὰ δὲ richtig P<sup>29</sup>). — Z. 17 <αἰ>θέρος Gö., We.: fort. θέρους Miller: αἰθρης Bunsen: Θέρος richtig P (wie dies schon Wilamowitz, Hermes 34,218, gesehen hatte; von We. unbeachtet). Dieses Θέρος gehört nicht zum Vers: es ist wahrscheinlich ein Titel (so auch Wilam.); die Vermutung von Festugière, Vigil. Christ. 3,207, es sei ein Lemma („une indication sur l'air selon lequel on doit chanter le psaume, κατὰ τὸ »θέρος«”), scheint mir weniger wahrscheinlich<sup>30</sup>).

(Fortsetzung folgt)

Cambridge (England)

M. Marcovich

## THE LIBRARY OF LIBANIUS\*)

In a recent work Festugière glanced briefly at the problem of the texts available to Libanius<sup>1</sup>). Despite his careful emphasis upon the provisional nature of this survey, such a statistical presentation of literary borrowings and sources may tempt the unwary into unwarranted conclusions. Care must be taken, as he rightly indicates, not to regard his list as complete in itself, nor yet as consistently representative of Libanius' treatment of his material, still less as representative of other sophists. The incidence of classical citations in such authors depends upon criteria both subjective and objective. A Himerius, with his exaggeratedly florid style, will differ, both in aim and in inspiration, from the more argumentative exposition and more subtle appeal to psychology presented by Libanius. Thus, besides using the corpus of literature which was basic to the Greek educational system — epic, drama, history and oratory,

29) Zu S. 167,7 u. 8 dreimal „Spatium von 2 Lettern P\* We.: belanglos, da der Schreiber wegen des Loches in der Bombycina auf diesem Raum überhaupt nicht schreiben konnte (dasselbe auf f. 77v).

30) So auch R. M. Grant, Vig. Christ. 11 (1957) 151.

\*) Textual references are to Libanius ed. Förster, Menander ed. Körte, to fragments of tragedy, Nauck, *T. G. F.*<sup>2</sup>, and lyric, Bergk<sup>4</sup>.

1) *Antioche Païenne et Chrétienne*, 216 and 509.

Himerius characteristically displays a degree of proficiency with material from lyric which is most unusual in 4th century writers. In the Libanian corpus itself, different genres require differences of matter and treatment which are to be observed not merely in a comparison of orations, declamations and letters, but in any assessment of the orations themselves <sup>2)</sup>.

The broad outline of Libanius' course is essentially that recommended long before by Dio Chrysostom and Quintilian, and even then of tried utility and venerable antiquity <sup>3)</sup>. 'Homer, Hesiod and other poets, Demosthenes, Lysias and other orators, Herodotus, Thucydides and other historians' is his own account of his basic course <sup>4)</sup>. If philosophy as such is absent from his curriculum, unlike that offered by Dio to his more mature student, the reason is to be found in that dichotomy between rhetoric and philosophy in the Hellenic tradition, whereby philosophy had been elevated into a post-graduate study of high prestige and specialist appeal. In any case, Xenophon, traditionally regarded as a philosopher, and Plato figure in his course, but rather from the point of view of form and diction than of content <sup>5)</sup>. In fact, the literary influence of Plato is observable throughout his works, second only to Demosthenes, with vocabulary taken not merely from the more obviously sophistic works but from comparatively recondite works such as the *Laws*. It may also seem odd to find no explicit mention of the dramatists, but they, along with Pindar and others, seem to be included under the blanket designation of 'the other poets'. Familiarity with drama is well attested by citation and reference throughout his works <sup>6)</sup>, as is only to be expected, and, in the case of Old Comedy in particular, it is confirmed by the admiring comments of Eunapius <sup>7)</sup>. The general picture is that of a wide literary expertise, where deep knowledge and sincere admiration of classical models enable him to adapt language and circumstance into a style peculiarly his own. Eunapius may commend him for his handling of Old Comedy, but later his

2) Cf. Petit, *Recherches sur la publication et la diffusion des discours de Libanius*. *Historia* 5, 479 ff.

3) Dio, *Or.* 18, 8 ff. Quintilian 10, 1, 68 ff.

4) *Ep.* 1036.

5) E. g. *Or.* 2, 24.

6) E. g. *Or.* 1, 9; 2, 48.

7) *VS* 16, 2, 3 (p. 496): ὁ δὲ ὥσπερ κορυφὴν παιδείας τοῦτο ἐπετήδευσεν, ἐκ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμῳδίας ὅλος εἰς τὸ ἀπαγγέλλειν εἰλκυσμένος...

Byzantine admirers praise him no less for his adaptations of his model orator by referring to him simply as 'Demosthenes the Second' <sup>8)</sup>).

Investigation of the texts at his disposal is undoubtedly complicated by the scholastic fashions of his day. If at times the sophist airs his own erudition with precise reference to his models, at others he will tickle his audience's vanity by allowing them the opportunity of appreciating his artful adaptation for themselves. The result is more allusiveness and less direct citation. The earlier habit of quoting *in extenso*, such as that of Dio or Plutarch, had given place to a skilful integration of the citation into the form and fabric of the imitation, so producing a more impressionist effect. Quotations are no more than snippets and vocabulary from diverse sources is interwoven to produce a stock sentiment in quite novel form. For example, the prooemium of the *Autobiography* introduces the theme of the oration in terms reminiscent of the stock rhetorical thesis 'Should one practise rhetoric?' <sup>9)</sup>. It proceeds immediately by deliberate anacoluthon and emotive vocabulary (*δδυνῶν καὶ πόνων*) to a manifestation of literary piety secured by intrusive hints of Homer <sup>10)</sup>, and manages to produce an effect of harking back to the attitude assumed by Isocrates in a similar situation <sup>11)</sup>. The topic of place of origin and family, which by tradition must next be treated, is introduced by a lyric quotation culled from the same place in the Plutarchian *Life of Demosthenes* <sup>12)</sup>. Thus, in the shortest space, while keeping rigidly to the rules of composition, he has suggested to his audience a succession of sources of inspiration, without overt mention of any.

A further problem is to decide whether his quotations and references are taken direct from his primary sources or whether they come through intermediaries. His was the culture of the commentator and the excerptor, and his stock in trade was largely that of paraphrase and anecdote. It is clear at the outset that Libanius had, besides basic texts, a large store of such sophistic material, one obvious item being the collection

8) Cf. Förster, *Vol. 1*, p. 74.

9) Cf. Hermogenes, *Progymnasmata* (ed. Rabe) p. 25: *εἰ ῥητορευτέον*.

10) *Il.* 24, 527 for *τὰ τῆς τύχης ἐκέρασαν* *Od.* 9, 495: *μὴ βάλοι βέλος*.

11) *Antidosis* 1-7.

12) *Plut. Dem.* 1 f. = *Eurip. fr.* 4 (Bergk).

of literary and popular proverbs with which his works abound. Similarly, he had access to a collection of myth and fable of both national and local interest, as is clear from the *Antiochicus*, not to mention the technical works necessary for the study and teaching of rhetoric. The learning that pervades his work is based as firmly on the encyclopaedia as on personal knowledge of texts.

Thus the basis for any examination of his texts can be only relatively complete — the assumption that the absence of any traceable reference to any author implies that Libanius had no access to him, but it cannot be assumed in consequence that references to any work automatically imply direct access to it.

As is to be expected, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* he knows by heart. He also has the widest acquaintance with the works of Hesiod, including the *Certamen*<sup>13</sup>). This poetry is fundamental to his system. Other poets include Aesop<sup>14</sup>) and Theognis, not unexpectedly in the case of poetry of such gnomic tone<sup>15</sup>). Thereafter, the count becomes strangely small. With post-Homeric Hymns and epic, for all the evidence of acquaintance with the basic legends, there is little in the way of recognizable citation. References to the *Nostoi* or the *Iliou Persis* appear, but only in the most general terms<sup>16</sup>). Alexandrian poetry also is conspicuous by its absence, even though some of its themes had become part of the sophistic stock in trade. Only Aratus appears in direct citation, but even here in words and sentiment such as had long provided material for rhetoric<sup>17</sup>). Of Callimachus there is no evidence of any actual acquaintance, even though a few coincidences exist in the legends of Artemis as related by poet and sophist<sup>18</sup>). As for Apollonius, the story of Medea when used by Libanius owes less to him than to the drama of Euripides<sup>19</sup>), and there is no trace of inspiration from the text of the poem. In such cases as these it appears to come rather from the commentator, and inevitably one looks for some evidence of the influence of an Apollodorus. Here, the coin-

13) Cf. *Decl.* 1, 65.

14) Cf. *Or.* 62, 44.

15) *Or.* 52, 28 (et al.) = Th. 35. *Decl.* 1, 78 : 88 : 89 = Th. 25; 173 ff.: 847. *Vitup.* 6, 12 = Th. 177.

16) E. g. *Refut.* 2, 1. *Confirm.* 1.

17) *Or.* 12, 14 = Arat. *Phaen.* 2 ff.

18) *Or.* 5, 27 : *ib.* 39. Callimachus *fr.* 96 ed. Pfeiffer.

19) E. g. *Decl.* 4, 20 ff.

cidences provided by Libanius' wide employment of myth, insufficient in themselves, receive some confirmation from an apparent verbal adaptation of Apollodorus in an exaggeratedly horrific narration of an episode of his own life <sup>20</sup>).

With lyric and similar poetry he shows his capacity and limitations most clearly. Like most of his kind, he makes a parade of learning by introducing into his own composition references to famous writers of lyric, almost as a matter of course, but upon closer examination many of these allusions are found to be a mere façade of maxims and anecdotes derived from lexicons or paroemiographers, with no independent value soever. Thus, the mention of Anacreon, Archilochus, Praxilla, Simonides and Stesichorus disguises the fact that allusion is made only to an anecdote or proverb, not to the text <sup>21</sup>). Of references to Alcaeus, Sappho or Tyrtaeus <sup>22</sup>), the only one that is basic is Sappho *fr.* 130, and, even so, it is so anecdotal in tone as to belie direct knowledge. Of Phocylides, citations are proverbial and can be traced through intermediaries <sup>23</sup>). Bacchylides remains unmentioned and almost certainly unused. It is with Pindar that he makes most consistent play, and in so doing most clearly reveals his limitations. If one excludes his merely lexicographical use of Pindar where the lyric vocabulary is employed as stock embellishment in his rhetoric, Libanius can provide no textual reference whatever to the *Nemeans* and *Isthmians*. Even with the *Pythians* acquaintance is doubtful, the passages claimed by Förster being dismissed by Snell. His knowledge of Pindar, and of lyric, begins and virtually ends with the *Olympians*. His understanding of the poems is profound and his handling of them frequent and expert, applied in every branch of his work, Orations, Declamations and Letters, and amounting to more than half of the citations that have been claimed to be Pindaric. In addition he uses Pindaric fragments almost a score of times, and these might

20) Or. 1, 146: οἷς ἦν ἡδὺ καὶ ταύρου τὸν νεκρὸν ἐκδήσαντας ἀφείναι διὰ πετρῶν φέρεσθαι. Apoll. 3, 5, 5: τὴν δὲ Δίρκην δήσαντες ἐκ ταύρου θανοῦσαν ῥίπτουσιν εἰς κρήνην.

21) E. g. Or. 64, 87. Or. 39, 24 : 1, 74 : Decl. 1, 180. Ep. 797. Or. 5, 53. Ep. 923.

22) Or. 13, 5. Or. 12, 18: *ib.* 99. Or. 11, 161: Ep. 950. = Alc. *fr.* 33. Sappho *fr.* 3: *fr.* 130. Tyrtaeus *fr.* 15: *fr.* 2.

23) Phocyl. *fr.* 10 = Plato *Rep.* 3, 407 a = Ep. 1512. Ps.—Phoc. *fr.* 16 = Schol. Ar. *Nub.* 240 = Ep. 1473. Phoc. *fr.* 5 = Dio Chr. Or. 36, 13 (II, 80 R) = Or. 19, 51.

be regarded as evidence of a wider knowledge. Upon examination, however, the majority of these are found to come to him through some known intermediary. Of these the best examples are *Decl.* 1, 87: ὑπερτάτῃ χειρὶ βιάζεται τὸ δίκαιον = Plato *Gorg.* 484 b, 488 b = Pindar, *fr.* 169, and *Decl.* 17, 26: ἔρεσιμα τῆς Ἑλλάδος = Isocr. *Antid.* 166 and Schol. Aristoph. *Nub.* 299 = Pindar *fr.* 76. Others, which form an integral part of his style, are derived from the lexicon — such as *Or.* 1, 273 (et al.) κρηπίδα βαλόμενος = Pindar *fr.* 77, citations such as these being standard among the Second Sophistic, appearing in Aristeides, for instance, and Libanius' use of them is typical. For three fragments only does he provide independent evidence, and these are the briefest of snippets and frankly proverbial in tone<sup>24</sup>). The conclusion must be that all of Pindar that Libanius had was the *Olympians* and some selected citations, some derived from classical authors and others from a reference encyclopaedia. As compared with Himerius, his scope is more confined, and clearly, in Antioch before A.D. 336, the teaching of lyric which he had himself received had been reduced to Byzantine proportions, and thereafter he personally had neither interest nor occasion to expand his acquaintance with it during his career in Athens, Constantinople, Nicomedeia or Antioch. This must have been a policy of deliberate restriction on his part, for although it is possible that this was all that was available in Antioch, it is highly unlikely that it was so in Athens, since Himerius had more at his disposal at a time when Libanius was active in the same circle.

With drama there is a similar tendency towards selectivity. His knowledge of most of drama is profound, and his employment of it is clever. Aeschylus, apart from the *Oresteia*, is the least popular of his tragedians, and it must be admitted that it would need a sophistic *tour de force* to integrate the majestic diction and monumental simplicity of action of Aeschylus with the recondite subtleties of rhetoric in any fully consistent manner. Sophocles, especially in the Theban plays, provides him with much material, but it is Euripides at his most rhetorical who is his favourite, the *Orestes*, *Medea*, *Phoenissae*, *Hecuba* and *Alceste*, for instance, leaving him a rich claim to work. Here again, in his own preference of plays, it would appear that Libanius is already well on the way to the selectivity charac-

24) *Or.* 14, 21 = *fr.* 279. *Ep.* 36 = *fr.* 288. *Ep.* 1218 = *fr.* 230.

teristic of the Byzantines. References to some parts of extant drama, such as the *P.V.*, *Septem*, *Supplices*, *Trachiniae*, *Philoctetes*, *Heracleidae*, *Ion*, are relatively fewer, but his acquaintance with them cannot thereby be disproved. What is certain is that he had no wider acquaintance of drama beyond the received corpus. Dramatic fragments cited by him may be classed, almost entirely, into two categories: (i) quotations found in authors basic to his course or in commentaries upon them. Thus, *Ep.* 516: ὅστις γὰρ ὁμιλῶν ἤδεται Θεμιστίῳ, οὐ πώποτ' ἠρώτησα, γινώσκων ὅτι... = Eurip. *Phoenix*, fr. 812, comes to him through quotation in Aesch. c. *Timarch.*, 152—3 and Dem. *F. L.* 245. Similarly, the comparison of the condemnation of Socrates and the death of the nightingale does not draw its inspiration from Euripides' *Palamedes* direct but through the story current in later rhetoric<sup>25</sup>), while another reference to the same play comes by way of the text and scholia of Aristophanes<sup>26</sup>), as does that to Sophocles' *Tereus*<sup>27</sup>). (ii) Quotations of the second class come from the normal collections of saws and maxims. All of these have a gnomic quality, but some enjoyed more notoriety in antiquity because of disputed attribution<sup>28</sup>). Others, like *Or.* 59.106: πολλῶν χειρῶν ἰσχυρότερον βούλευμα σοφίας μετέχον = Eurip. *Antiope* fr. 200, which was a favourite tag for the sophists of the 4th century, may have attracted attention from its use in the Plutarchian Life of Homer (*Mor.* 790 a)<sup>29</sup>). The limitations of these additional sources to Libanius' knowledge of drama are indicated by the fact that for three fragments only does he stand as the basic authority<sup>30</sup>), and of these the first two are in fact spurious as fragments of tragedy, as Förster showed<sup>31</sup>). Other quite general references to dramas dealing

25) *Decl.* 1, 175 = Eur. *Pal.* fr. 588 = D. L. 2, 44. Schol. Isocr. *Busiris*.

26) *Decl.* 2, 28 = Eur. *Pal.* fr. 578 = Ar. *Thesm.* 770—6 and Schol.

27) *Decl.* 13, 56: καλῶς ἄρα οἱ τραγῳδοὶ ταῦτα ἐδίδασκον, τὸν Τηρέα, τὴν Πρόκνην = Nauck p. 257 = Ar. *Av.* 100 and Schol.

28) *Or.* 1, 164. *Ep.* 35, 3 = Soph. *Aj. Locr.* fr. 13: σοφοὶ τύραννοι τῇ σοφῶν συνουσίᾳ = Zenob. *Par.* 4, 98. (But Plato *Theag.* 125 b = Eurip.)

29) Similarly, *Ep.* 557 = Eurip. fr. 963 = Plut. *Mor.* 102 f.

30) (a) *Ep.* 175 (et al.) = Aesch. fr. 340: ἐκ τῶν πόνων τίκτεσθαι τὰς ἀρετὰς βροτοῖς.

(b) *Ep.* 571 = Eurip. fr. 934: νοῦν ἔχοντος . . . φίλον πρίασθαι χρημάτων πολλῶν σαφῆ.

(c) *Or.* 64, 47 = Soph. fr. 739: ὁ τι γὰρ φύσις ἀνέρι δῶ, τόδ' οὐποτ' ἂν ἐξέλκοις.

31) *Vol.* x, p. 163: p. 537. (a) = Ps.-Phoc. 163: (b) = Eur. *Or.* 1155.



with Minos and Pasiphae or to *the Miletou Halosis* imply nothing more than the use of a book of reference<sup>32</sup>).

Similarly with comedy: what he knows, he knows very well indeed, and he handles it with that expert touch which elicited the admiration of Eunapius. However, even if this commendation of him is couched in terms of Eupolidean imagery<sup>33</sup>), there is little doubt that Libanius' acquaintance with Old Comedy is confined to Aristophanes alone, and to no more of Aristophanes than is now extant. Except for a collection of proverbial characters and sayings (e. g., Dios Corinthos, Eurybatus, the golden Colophon), the only indication of wider knowledge is a mention of the *Aeolosicon* (*Ep.* 506), in itself as proverbial as that of the arrogance of Alcibiades that accompanies it. We do know, however, that the *Acharnians* was one of the text books which he studied as a boy under the *grammatistes*<sup>34</sup>), and every extant comedy provides some reference or quotation for him. In addition he had, as is evident from consideration of the *Tereus* and *Palamedes* above, a store of commentary on Aristophanes — certainly on the *Clouds*, *Birds* and *Thesmophoriazusae*, and probably on the rest.

As with Old Comedy, so with the New, his characteristic activity was lexicographical and grammatical — the choice of comic vocabulary, refurbishing it and placing it in a new sophistic setting<sup>35</sup>). He clearly employed a collection of comic characters and situations<sup>36</sup>), but this was as traditional in the schools of rhetoric as his choice of themes. His own primness, his dislike of the contemporary stage and the sophist's consciousness of his social duty seem to have removed, to a large extent, the comically immoral and erotic from his declamations, and there is none of the naughtiness of Lucian (cf. *Or.* 64, 73). So, if he imports into the *Autobiography* a recognition scene, or makes of Fortune a speaking character "as in plays", this is done in most general terms and from the

32) *Or.* 64, 73. *Decl.* 1, 177. *Decl.* 19, 26.

33) Eunap. *l. c.* τὰ γοῦν Εὐπόλιδος δένδρα Λαισποδῖαν καὶ Δαμασίαν οὐκ ἂν παρῆκεν, εἰ τὰ ὀνόματα ἔγνω τῶν δένδρων, οἷς νῦν αὐτὰ καλοῦσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι. οὕτω λέξιν ἐθρῶν τινα περιττὴν καὶ ὅπ' ἀρχαιότητος διαλανθάνουσαν, ὡς ἀνάθημά τι παλαιὸν καθαιρῶν, εἰς μέσον τε ἤγεν καὶ διακαθήρας ἐκαλλώπιζεν.

34) *Or.* 1, 9. Not, as Petit (*Vie Municipale*, 124 n.) maintains, an actual performance on the stage.

35) E. g. *Decl.* 32, 30; cf. Eunap. *l. c.*

36) E. g. *Or.* 64, 83. *Decl.* 32, 37–8.

respectable motive of rounding off the peroration of his original story with the romantic account of true scholastic success<sup>37</sup>). His material from New Comedy is more often the sententious or the psychological, and it may be seriously doubted whether he had any complete text directly available. He may construct an oration on servitude from a tag of Philemon, but this is merely stock stuff, characteristic of a collection of moral aphorisms<sup>38</sup>). He garnishes his narrative with satirical snippets or proverbial snatches from Ehippus or Menander, but they are snippets indeed<sup>39</sup>). It is to be noted that these diverse borrowings from comedy, whether of vocabulary or of situation, tend to occur in pairs or groups, with the references at no great distance from each other, and thereby indicate their source of origin as the encyclopaedia<sup>40</sup>). Other more extended passages are as clearly derivative<sup>41</sup>), and if, in his abuse of Constantinople, he draws upon Menander for his picture of a hard-drinking society, the passage is culled not from Menander himself but from an existing collection of such information, in this case Aelian<sup>42</sup>). Even with the *Dyscolus*, where the connection is undeniable<sup>43</sup>), it must still remain an open question whether it was ever primary. In view of Libanius' general practice, it is much more likely that his inspiration came from the collections current in antiquity — abstracts of Menander's plays like that of Sellius (cf. Suidas *s. v.*) or *P. Oxy.* 10, 81 ff., or summaries, like that of the *Dyscolus*, which rested on the authority of Aristophanes of Byzantium. More significant still is the way the play and the character had been put repeatedly through the sophistic mincing machine before Libanius' time, as the parallels adduced by Martin clearly indicate<sup>44</sup>). Here, it is obvious that Aelian has the closest connection with the original, with Lucian and Libanius further removed: the detail

37) *Or.* 1, 150. *Or.* 1, 155: 190: cf. Menander *Vol.* 1, 138–9.

38) *Or.* 25, 7: *ib.* 68. = Philem. *Theb.* (M. iv. 11) = Stob. *Fl.* 62, 8.

39) *Or.* 1, 32: κριοῦ τροφεῖα: Men. *fr.* 804. *Or.* 1, 35: σεμνὸς σεμνῶς: Ehipp. *Pelt.* (Athen. 8, 346 f). *Decl.* 26, 34: Ἀράβιος ἀδληγῆς: Δωδωναίων χαλκῆτον: Men. *fr.* 30: *fr.* 60.

40) Cf. also notes 35 and 36.

41) *Or.* 2, 66: εἰς ἐστὶ δοῦλος οἰκίας ὁ δεσπότης = Arist. II, 204 D = Men. *fr.* 716.

42) *Or.* 1, 75–6 = Men. *fr.* 61 = Aelian *V. H.* 3, 14 (Athen. 10, 442 d).

43) Cf. Schmid: *Menanders Dyskolos und die Timonlegende*, Rh. Mus. 102 (1959), 157 ff.

44) Cf. Menander *Dyscolus*, ed. Martin (1958).

in Aelian's adaptation of *Dysc.* 120 f. is in strong contrast with the bald statement of Libanius, and is in keeping with the very full treatment he gives of lines 10 ff., 153 f. and 162 ff. The parallels provided by Libanius usually show more vagueness of vocabulary and incident, and, upon examination, are capable of sub-division: —

- (a) *Dysc.* 91 : Liban. *Decl.* 27,18. No parallel at all.
- (b) *Dysc.* 84 : Liban. *Decl.* 26,1. *Dysc.* 388 : *Decl.* 27,13.  
Verbal echoes of generalized characterization only.
- (c) *Dysc.* 115 : *Decl.* 27,5 (τὴν δημοσίαν δδόν) : Dem. 55,16.  
*Dysc.* 376 : *Decl.* 27,21 (τὴν αἵμασιάν οἰκοδομήσας) : Dem.  
55,11.

Descriptions of ordinary rustic activities. Although Libanius here provides the only sophistic echo of the play, it is no less an echo of Demosthenes.

- (d) *Dysc.* 169 f. : *Decl.* 26,4 (ἐλθὼν ἂν εἰς ἐρημίαν ... ἀπηγγόμην).
- Dysc.* 605 f. : *Decl.* 27,18 (γεωργῶ ... ἔχθον τραχύν, θύμον  
γεωργοῦντα καὶ σφάκον).

*Dysc.* 627 : *Decl.* 27,1 (ὁ δύσκολος ὤλισθεν).

Again Libanius gives the only parallel. They appear to be items in a collection of comic situations. The first is notoriously so <sup>45</sup>), the second, although a verbal echo of Menander, is a generalization on peasant life, while the last and most exact parallel of circumstance is not followed up in the declamation. If he had the text of the play in front of him, it is remarkable that he did not make fuller use of it, especially of the scene from line 620 on.

It follows that the argument that Libanius did not use the text of Menander can be maintained with consistency and plausibility. All of these parallels are capable of explanation as items derived from collections of characters and situations, and when his general practice is considered, it appears extremely probable that this was in fact their source of origin. If this is so, the schools of Antioch were working on a strangely restricted literary curriculum. Even Sidonius in Gaul a century later could do better than this. Moreover, he appears not to have had access to a really wide selection of supplementary extracts like that of Athenaeus. The coincidences between them are comparatively few, and one would expect, considering Libanius' known interest

45) Cf. Schmid, *o. c.*

in comedy, to find much more common ground in the citations. An *argumentum ex silentio* in this field is supported by another in the field of local history, for nowhere in the *Antiochicus* does Libanius use the long extract from Polybius which Athenaeus quotes for the description of Antiochus Epiphanes' games at Daphne, a passage which would appear most apposite for his theme.

Of prose writers, his favourite historians are Herodotus and Thucydides, Xenophon being a good third, with use made both of the historical and Socratic works. The actual text of Thucydides was used by his scholars, and he possessed several copies (*Or.* I, 148 ff.). All the rest are mere shadows. Acquaintance with Arrian, as claimed by Förster, is rightly rejected by Roos<sup>46</sup>). The coincidence of *Or.* 5,39 with Diodorus 4, 22 is no more cogent than that with Callimachus in the same oration. His handling of subsidiary historical sources, in fact, appears very similar to that of his subsidiaries to drama, as is shown by his alleged indebtedness to Theopompus<sup>47</sup>). Here, Libanius certainly reproduces the words of Aristophon, as recorded by Theopompus (*fr.* 159), and he gives the historian's list of Amphictyons in order (*fr.* 77), but the ultimate source of the first is a quotation by Didymus in his *Commentaries on Demosthenes*, and the second is a lexicographical list finally reproduced by Harpocration. The nature of these references, and their survival in the kind of work that Libanius is known to have used, strongly suggests that what he was using was not the text of Theopompus but merely citations at second hand. The same is probably the case with his debt to the Atthidographers. On the other hand, there is no doubt at all about his constant use of the suggested *lexicon mythologicum* for his stories of Greece in general and Antioch in particular<sup>48</sup>). As for other historians, Libanius simply was not interested in Polybius or the period of which he wrote. Of Plutarch, both from the *Morals* and the *Lives*, he seems to have some works available. These have little relation to the Roman period, but the vast amount of common ground provided by the history of classical Greece is supplemented by verbal similarities, notably the deliberate adaptation to his own career of the quotation used

46) *Or.* 61, 16 = *Arr. Bithyn. fr.* 32. But cf. Roos, *Arrian* ii, p. xxviii.

47) *Hell. Oxy. fr.* 159: *fr.* 77. Cf. Förster, *Vol.* vi, p. 186.

48) Cf. Förster, *Vol.* v, p. 412.

by Plutarch to introduce his life of Demosthenes, mentioned above. Förster is surely overcautious in questioning his acquaintance with the *Lives* <sup>49</sup>), for texts were available and Julian in A. D. 363 possessed something which is most plausibly identified with the Life of Crassus <sup>50</sup>). However, Libanius' complete neglect of the Roman period in the selection of his material, which is so notable a feature of the *Antiochicus*, denies him the use of almost all later historians. For him history ended with Demosthenes and did not begin again until Diocletian, and this attitude had a constricting effect upon his literary sources. Access to Diogenes Laertius seems virtually certain <sup>51</sup>), but the only other known source is Dionysius of Halicarnassus, cited twice by name <sup>52</sup>).

An intimate and encyclopaedic knowledge of the text of the Attic orators is immediately obvious, his prime interest, of course, being with Demosthenes, whose orations he studied scientifically and whose style was so successfully adapted as to become an integral part of his own. Lysias, we know, was part of his teaching course, but he also makes full use of Isocrates and Aeschines, and speaks as one with authority on the work of Isaeus, Hypereides, Deinarchus, Lycurgus and Antiphon <sup>53</sup>). The *Hypotheses of Demosthenes* — his earliest known work, dedicated to Montius, proconsul of Constantinople in A. D. 352 — are interesting in that they retain the ancient order of the texts of the orations <sup>54</sup>), and present the divergent views of the scholars who had preceded him. Libanius clearly had other commentaries besides that of Dionysius, and Didymus, as has been seen, was most probably one of these. The coincidences of fact with Diodorus Siculus which appear in his Life of Demosthenes should be interpreted as emanating, in all probability, from such a commentary. These earlier scholars, when not mentioned by name, receive various group designations — οἱ πολλοί (*Hyp.* 31,2 : 58,4), οἱ πρεσβύτεροι or τινες (*Hyp.* 7,5). In the latter case, although he mentions the attribution of the speech to

49) Cf. Förster, *Vol.* vi, p. 370.

50) *Or.* 18, 233.

51) Cf. note 25. Also *Decl.* 1, 154–6 = D. L. 2, 13: *ib.* 165 = D. L. 2, 25.

52) *Hyp. Dem. Prooem.* 20. *Hyp. Dem. Or.* xxiii, 11.

53) *Hyp. Or.* xxi, 2. *Hyp. Or.* 17. *Hyp. Or.* lvii, 4. *Hyp. Or.* xxvi, 6 ff. *Liban. Or.* 64, 21.

54) Cf. Förster, *Vol.* viii, p. 575–6.

Hegesippus, he clearly has no personal knowledge of his style. Of other pieces of classical oratory, he consistently accepts the *Ad Demonicum* as Isocratean<sup>55</sup>), and he can utilize Polycrates' oration for his *Apologia Socratis*<sup>56</sup>).

In philosophy, despite Julian's complimentary remark (*Or.* 1,131), Libanius never claimed to be expert. For all that, he knew his Plato thoroughly. With others the situation is more uncertain. His complete lack of interest in physics and metaphysics cut him off from much of philosophical theory, so that Aristotle is rarely mentioned, Theophrastus never, and while Stoics and Epicureans are also absent, Diogenes and the Cynics appear, but only for their anecdotal value, not for the quality or content of their thinking<sup>57</sup>). He certainly did not employ Aristotle in his course: only perhaps to the *Ethics* did he pay any attention<sup>58</sup>). This is not surprising: the lecture-note style in which so much of Aristotle's work is presented would have offended his canons of taste and seemed repugnant to his refined ear. To him, as to many of his time, philosophy consisted of Pythagoras, Plato and Socrates, and if other pre-Socratics appear from time to time, it is mainly in the form of truisms and epigrams<sup>59</sup>). The remaining philosophic literature consists merely of Xenophon and the Socratic letters<sup>60</sup>). However, it does not follow that he, a rhetor with little need of philosophy in his teaching course, had no serious acquaintance with it. It has been remarked by Festugière that he is in line with the scholastic tradition in his views upon the nature of the soul<sup>61</sup>), and ethics and psychology shared a common ground with the practice of rhetoric. He was not unacquainted with Neo-Platonists and their taboos<sup>62</sup>). He knew of Porphyry's work against the Christians, recorded it as being in Julian's possession<sup>63</sup>), and probably read it for himself. Although Plotinus is unmentioned and probably unknown to him, Iamblichus, Sopater and Maximus

55) *Ep.* 21, 14. *Ep.* 504. *Or.* 57, 43.

56) Cf. Förster, *Vol.* v. p. 1 ff. Markowski, *De Libanio Socratis Defensore*, pp. 20-66.

57) E. g. *Or.* 17, 16. *Chria*, 2.

58) E. g. *Or.* 1, 123. *Ar. E. N.* 5, 8.

59) E. g. *Or.* 12, 32 (Anaxagoras).

60) *Decl.* 1, 166 = *Socr. Ep.* 1. *Decl.* 1, 174 = *Ep.* 17.

61) Cf. Festugière, *Rev. d'Herm. Trism.* iii, p. 14 n.

62) *Decl.* 13, 19 f.

63) *Or.* 18, 173.

were all warmly commended as philosophers, so that it is perhaps hard to deny him all knowledge of their works. Even so, he did not allow himself to deviate into the abstruse mysteries of later Neo-Platonism. His kind of Platonism remained literary and severely classical.

Instead, it was the Second Sophistic that attracted him. Aristeides, who became a model for style and neurosis, heads the list, with imitations and references not merely in *Or.* 61 and 64 but throughout all branches of composition. Libanius certainly had more than one text of his works, and the influence of Aristeides' purely rhetorical work is clearly to be seen. The *Hieroi Logoi* of Aristeides were not without their effect on the tone and composition of the Autobiography, as Pack and others have already indicated<sup>64</sup>). Another source of inspiration is to be found in Philostratus, the *Imagines*, *Life of Apollonius* and the *Lives of the Sophists* all providing passages or ideas for adaptation or imitation<sup>65</sup>). Indeed, the information provided by the *Lives*, coupled with his own reading of Aristeides, seems to have influenced his sophistic attitudes and behaviour considerably. An interest in the declamations of Polemo, whose poses and comments he imitates, seems to have originated from the same source<sup>66</sup>). His eagerness to acquire texts of these sophistic writers is shown by his requests for copies of the *Odaenathus* of Longinus, and the works of Favorinus and of Hadrian of Tyre, whose *Epitaphius on Paris* he mentions elsewhere<sup>67</sup>). Acquaintance with Lucian, although nowhere explicitly mentioned, is more than probable. Of the Lucianic corpus, he employs the pseudo-Lucianic *περὶ ἀρχήσεως* for the composition of *Or.* 64, and he apparently possesses the *Ocypus*, since this seems identical with the *Podagra* of his friend Acacius<sup>68</sup>). The common ground, most notable in the selection of vocabulary and in the treatment of certain themes like the story of Timon especially, would indicate acquaintance with other Lucianic pieces, although the spirit of the two sophists is often very different. Aelian, also unmentioned by name, provides him with material, from the

64) *Ep.* 631: 1534. *Proth. Decl.* 46. Cf. Pack, *Two sophists and two Emperors*, *C. P.* 42 (1947), 17-20.

65) *Or.* 1, 12. *Or.* 4, 4. *Or.* 16, 56. Cf. Pack, *l. c.* Norman, in *C. P.* 48, p. 20 ff.

66) *Or.* 5, 40. *Decl.* 11, 35.

67) *Ep.* 1078: 1178: 631. *Or.* 64, 41.

68) *Ep.* 1301.

Letters for the Timon story, and from the general collection of the *Varia Historia* for certain details in the *Autobiography* <sup>69</sup>). The Letters of Alciphron, though a dull lot, still succeeded in engaging his attention and provide a few conceits. It would be very odd indeed for him to have no acquaintance with Dio Chrysostom. He remains nameless in Libanius, although he was a favourite with Julian, Themistius and Synesius. Upon examination, several of Libanius' moralizing themes are to be found in Dio <sup>70</sup>), and there are significant parallels between the orations to Julian and the collection of orations ascribed to Dio <sup>71</sup>). This concentrated interest in Dio may possibly be regarded as a piece of special research intended for the edification of Dio's admirer, Julian. Another sophistic element to be observed throughout his works but especially in the *Autobiography* and the declamations is the influence of romance. The novelettish themes of declamations were as often as not inherited, but the treatment and vocabulary are those of the romantic novel proper. There is a notable identity of expression with Heliodorus and the rest <sup>72</sup>), and the romantic element in the original *Autobiography* is undeniable <sup>73</sup>).

Of his contemporaries, although Libanius tended to be a carping critic, Julian received his unreserved admiration — not without some self-satisfaction, since it was generally accepted that he had had some influence on Julian's literary style <sup>74</sup>). Thus in the Julianic orations, citations and references are frequent, the *Misopogon* being fundamental for Or. 15 and the *Ep. ad S. P. Q. Ath.* for the *Epitaphius*. Acquaintance with the oratory of Himerius, which for all their differences is likely enough *per se* (cf. *Ep.* 469), is hinted at by an echo in Or. 1, 285 (ἱερεὺς θεῶν cf. Him. Or. 8, 7: παῖδα τὸν ἱερόν). As for Themistius, he acknowledges with fulsome flattery the receipt of orations which came to him by way of presentation, and he has no compunction in including into his own narrative an incident

69) Cf. note 42. Also Or. 1, 255; εἰς σάρκας ἐπιδούς = Ael. V. H. 9, 13.

70) E. g. The absence of stasis in heaven: Dio, 38, 11. Lib. Or. 21, 19.

71) [Dio] 37, 11 and 17-19 = Lib. Or. 14, 28. [Dio] 37, 32 = Lib. Or. 15, 28-9. Here note the order of references, Socrates, Pythagoras and Plato, and the accompanying mention of the gods.

72) Cf. Rohde *Gr. Rom.*, pp. 434-6: 477 n. 493 n.

73) E. g. Or. 1, 75-77: 146-7.

74) Or. 15, 6 ff. 18, 14.



upon which Themistius had dilated at length <sup>75</sup>). Presentation remained the normal way of acquiring texts, and so he obtains his copies of Demetrius' *Seasons* or Acacius' *Asclepius* and *Marathonomachae at the Baths*, not to mention the works of other minor sophists <sup>76</sup>). His own works received a wider audience by this same method of presentation followed by recitation. Contemporary poetry he damns with faint praise: only an epic on an Homeric theme receives his commendation, and not unnaturally since its author was the praetorian prefect Tatianus. This had found its way into the school curriculum by A. D. 390 <sup>77</sup>). However, the oddest item in his library is without doubt the Eusebian *Vita Constantini*. Within a dozen years of Constantine's death Libanius used this as the basic source for his panegyric on his sons <sup>78</sup>). The close parallel between the Christian source and the pagan adaptation is some confirmation of an acquaintance with Christian literature that has been claimed and denied with equal exaggeration. The attempt to substitute the pagan Praxagoras as the ultimate source, simply on the strength of the notice in Photius, must fail for lack of evidence <sup>79</sup>).

The text books used in grammar, as distinct from literature, can only be guessed. An impressive list of parallels with the rhetor Anaximenes has been adduced <sup>80</sup>). Menander Rhetor also seems a likely source, for his rules are followed in precise detail in *Or.* 59 and in deliberate inversion in the invective of *Or.* 33 <sup>81</sup>). Hermogenes may also be assumed, and the influence of Aristotle's rhetoric is observable at first hand in *Or.* 1,37 <sup>82</sup>). It is likely however that such items as these form but part of his apparatus, for throughout his work there is evidence for his

75) *Ep.* 368: 434: 818, 3: 1430: 1495. (Cf. Bouchery, *Themistius in Libanius Brieven*, pp. 55: 270.) *Them. Or.* 19, 278 ff. = *Liban. Or.* 1, 239 ff.

76) *Ep.* 128: 695: 1342: 735. Cf. *Ep.* 895: 934:1009: 1066.

77) For Tatianus cf. *Ep.* 990. But for disparagement of poets, admittedly for reasons other than poetry, cf. *Or.* 1, 180: 28, 2.

78) Cf. Petit, *Libanius et la Vita Constantini*, *Historia* 1 (1950), 562 ff.

79) Cf. Moreau, *Zum Problem der Vita Constantini*, *Historia* 5, (1955), 234 ff. Photius, *Cod.* 62 p. 20 (B) = F. H. G. iv, 2 (Praxagoras).

80) Cf. Markowski, *o. c.*, 150 ff.

81) Cf. Sievers, *Das Leben des Libanios*, 130. Also Menander, *Rhet. Graec.* iii, 379.

82) Cf. *Ar. Rhet.* 3, 1418 b 23 ff.: ἐπειδὴ ἕνια περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγει, ἕτερον χρὴ λέγοντα ποιεῖν, ὅπερ Ἰσοκράτης ποιεῖ ἐν τῇ ἀντιδόσει. *Isocr. Antid.* 141-9.

consistent reliance upon works of reference. Miscellaneous items for his private eye seem to have included a dream book of some kind and some medical work, since he speaks authoritatively on both matters.

This literary catalogue discloses a fundamental lack of balance. Tradition had long excluded gymnastic from the field of the rhetorical education, and teachers such as Libanius had a well-merited dislike of the games and spectator sports then current<sup>83</sup>). But inside the field of literature itself, although various subjects were studied at greater depth and with more intensity, the scope had been narrowed drastically. This was not so much due to the undoubted difficulties attendant upon the production of texts as to the deliberate restrictions practised by the teaching profession itself with regard to the material to be taught. Rhetoric had long been the only form of mass education. Libanius, like Isocrates, found the criterion of his civilization to be language rather than race (*Or.* 11,184), and its instrument to be rhetoric. But in his hands rhetoric was divorced from the living language, and simultaneously large areas of the literature on which his culture depended had been abandoned, and the rest was being nibbled away by the excerptor and cataloguer, of which his own work on Demosthenes is an example. The only substitute for such losses was a continuous infusion of the cleverly superficial and second-hand learning of the Second Sophistic. So intent were the teachers upon their individual practice of declamation, upon which fame and fortune increasingly depended, that the business of teaching took second place and the use of and access to original literature, except for a traditionally received canon, became increasingly difficult. The teachers were thus cutting the ground away from under them. In Antioch Libanius and his clientèle had either no opportunity or no inclination to resort to more, and if the cultural standard of his school and the town be measured by the extent of its awareness of Hellenic literature, it seems to have been surprisingly low. It was, indeed, far lower than that of contemporary Egypt. There is nothing in Antioch to compare with the Alexandrian revival of philosophy, and Libanius provides little evidence of the interest in drama which papyri reveal in certain sections of 4th century Egyptian society. In addition, account must be taken of his complete lack of interest in the Hellenistic

---

83) E. g. *Or.* 1, 5, 44.

and Roman background, for in this he was as provincial as his Syriac speaking fellows. The decline of Latin in 4th century Antioch is well attested<sup>84</sup>), but the veneer of Hellenism is also revealed as unexpectedly thin, and this at a time when it faced a combination of pressures. With this contraction in the scope of the traditional Greek educational system and the decline of the curial class for which it had so long catered, its claim to universality, as exemplified in the person of the Oriental Libanius himself, was becoming more difficult to substantiate.

University of Hull (England)

A. F. Norman

---

## ZUR ATTICUS-VITA DES CORNELIUS NEPOS

---

Die Biographie, die Cornelius Nepos von Titus Pomponius Atticus gegeben hat, verdient mit Recht als ein einzigartiges Dokument Beachtung. Es ist nicht nur die Persönlichkeit des Atticus, die unser Interesse findet, sondern auch die Art, in der diese Skizze angelegt ist, denn sie gibt darüber Aufschluß, wie der Schriftsteller selbst zu seiner Aufgabe stand. Die Beurteilung würde sich verschieben, wenn Bedenken, die Rahn<sup>1)</sup> gegen das

---

84) E. g. Or. 1, 3: 1, 156: 49, 29. Cf. Haddad, *Aspects of social life in Antioch*, 108 ff.

1) Hermes 85, 1957, 205 ff. Die Bemerkungen gegen Leo verkennen, daß Leos legitime Fragestellung hier zu Ergebnissen geführt hat, die in dem oder jenem Punkt modifizierbar sind, aber auf fester Grundlage ruhen. An einer Ergänzung der Atticusvita nach dem Tod des Atticus ist ja nicht zu zweifeln, denn Nepos bezeugt sie ja selbst; edita sunt ist nicht gleich scripta sunt, die Möglichkeit, daß Atticus verschieden wäre, als Nepos noch an der Biographie schrieb, entfällt. Haec a nobis edita sunt besagt eindeutig, daß es sich um die publicatio und divulgatio handelt (Thes. L. L. VI 82, 49; die Skepsis gegenüber Wölfflin beruht auf der damaligen Unkenntnis der Überlieferung und ist durch die später erschienene Ausgabe von H. Malcovati (Corn. Nepotis quae exstant iteratis curis rec. H. M., Torino 1945, Corp. Parav.), die Rahn nach seiner Anmerkung S. 208 nicht eingesehen haben kann, beseitigt. Übrigens spricht die den Zusatz einleitende Bemerkung gegen gravierende Eingriffe in den vorausgehenden Text; 4, 5 ut opinor bezeugt weder die zweite Auflage noch eine „stilistische Bearbeitung des Materials nach dem Tode des Atticus in einem Zuge“, die Rahn verfißt. Die Wendung ist nichts als ein geläufiges Stilmittel, das gerade dann gern gebraucht wird,